

### Remarks

The Applicants note with appreciation the withdrawal of the previous rejections.

The Applicants have amended Claim 13 to recite that the coating layer comprises mainly a copolymer of a resin with a light stabilizer component that includes a hindered amine. Support may be found in Claim 15. The Applicants have also amended Claim 15 in view of the amendment to Claim 13. Entry into the official file and consideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

The Applicants note the new rejection of Claims 13 - 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the hypothetical combination of Ogawa with Miyakawa. The Applicants note in particular the Examiner's detailed and helpful comments concerning the hypothetical application of the combination to those rejected claims. The Applicants respectfully submit that even if one skilled in the art were to hypothetically make the combination, the resulting combination would still fail to teach or suggest the subject matter of the claims.

Independent Claim 13 recites a white film for a reflecting structure for surface light sources containing voids that has a light stabilizer-containing coating layer for at least one surface of the white film, wherein the coating layer comprises mainly a copolymer of a resin with a light stabilizer component that includes a hindered amine. The rejection frankly acknowledges that Miyakawa is silent as to the coating layer comprising a copolymer of an acrylic resin with a light stabilizer component.

The rejection turns to Ogawa to provide those teachings. The problem with Ogawa is that Ogawa fails to disclose, teach or suggest a light stabilizer component that includes a hindered amine. Instead, Ogawa is directed to other types of light stabilizers, none of which includes a component that includes a hindered amine. The Applicants have carefully scrutinized the entire Ogawa

disclosure and cannot find any reference to hindered amines, much less any hypothetical notion that hindered amines could or would provide any advantage to either the Ogawa coatings or the Ogawa coatings in combination with Miyagawa. In fact, the Applicants respectfully submit that Ogawa is non-enabling with respect to the solicited claims inasmuch as they specifically recite a light stabilizer component that includes a hindered amine and Ogawa fails to disclose, teach or suggest hindered amines at all. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were to make the hypothetical combination of Ogawa with Miyakawa, the resulting combination would still result in a coating that contains a light stabilizer, but not including a hindered amine. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Applicants note the rejection of Claims 13 - 17, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the hypothetical combination of Ogawa with Ishii. The Applicants also note the Examiner's frank acknowledgement that Ishii does not specifically disclose a protective layer containing a copolymer of an acrylic resin and a UV absorber.

The problem with this hypothetical combination is that it too, like the combination of Ogawa with Miyakawa, fails to provide teachings or suggestions that would result in a structure that includes a coating layer comprising mainly a copolymer of a resin with a light stabilizer component that includes a hindered amine. As noted above with respect to the hypothetical combination of Ogawa with Miyakawa, a hypothetical combination of Ogawa with Ishii would result in the same deficiency, namely a coating that does not include a light stabilizer component with a hindered amine.

The Applicants have already established that Ogawa fails to disclose, teach or suggest hindered amines. Therefore, hypothetically combining Ogawa with Ishii that also does not have a light stabilizer with a hindered amine does not cure the deficiency of the primary reference. Ogawa therefore remains non-enabling with respect to the hypothetical combination with Ishii. Withdrawal

of the rejection of Claims 13 - 17, 23 and 24 is accordingly respectfully requested.

The Applicants note the rejection of Claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the further hypothetical combination of Miyakawa with Ogawa and Ishii. This rejection must also fail for the same reasons set forth above with respect to the combinations of Ogawa with Miyakawa on the one hand and Ishii on the other hand. Ogawa is non-enabling with respect to teachings or suggestions concerning the inclusion of a hindered amine in a light stabilizer component. Therefore, hypothetically combining Miyakawa with Ogawa and Ishii would still fail to disclose, teach or suggest the coating layer comprising mainly a copolymer of a resin with a light stabilizer component that includes a hindered amine as recited in the rejected claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 20 and 21 is also respectfully requested.

The Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment raises no new issues for consideration and requires no searching inasmuch the amendment to Claim 13 only incorporates a portion of Claim 15 which subject matter has already been fully considered. Also, the Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to Claim 13 and 15 materially advance the application by virtue of the fact that the amendments place the entire Application into condition for allowance. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that the amendments be entered into the official file, considered on the merits and further request allowance of the solicited claims.

Respectfully submitted,

  
T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750

TDC/sh  
(215) 656-3381